Published in final edited form as:

J Cancer Surviv. 2018 February ; 12(1): 82–94. doi:10.1007/s11764-017-0647-7.

SurvivorCHESS To Increase Physical Activity In Colon Cancer Survivors: Can We Get Them Moving?

Deborah K. Mayer, PhD, RN¹, Gina Landucci, BS², Lola Awoyinka, MPH², Amy K. Atwood, PhD³, Cindy L. Carmack, PhD⁴, Wendy Demark-Wahnefried, PhD, RD⁵, Fiona McTavish, MS², and David H. Gustafson, PhD²

¹UNC Lineberger Cancer Center, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC

²Center for Health Enhancement Systems Studies, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin

³T-Mobile Workforce Analysis and Insights, Bellevue, WA

⁴Department of Behavior Science, M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas

⁵UAB Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of Alabama, Birmingham, AL

Abstract

Purpose—To determine the impact of SurvivorCHESS, an eHealth intervention, on physical activity in colon cancer survivors and to explore the impact of SurvivorChess on quality of life and distress.

Methods—This was a 2-arm single-blinded multi-site randomized controlled trial comparing a control group to an intervention group receiving a smart phone with the SurvivorChess program.

Results—Participants using SurvivorCHESS (n=144) increased their moderate to vigorous physical activities from 19.4 minutes at baseline to 50 minutes compared to the control group (n=140) increasing from 15.5 to 40.3 minutes at six months (p=.083) but was not sustained three months after the study ended. No significant differences were found between groups over time for quality of life or distress items. Reports of physical symptoms were greater than other categories for distress items. Patients who had a higher body mass index and number of comorbid conditions were less likely to increase their physical activity. Self-determination theory including autonomous motivation and relatedness were not associated with the outcomes.

Conclusions—Physical activity did increase over time in both groups and was not significantly different with the use of the eHealth intervention, SurvivorCHESS, compared to the control group. Amount of SurvivorCHESS use was not associated with physical activity.

Corresponding author: Deborah K. Mayer, PhD, RN, UNC Lineberger Cancer Center, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27599-7460, dmayer@unc.edu, (office) 919-843-9467, (fax) 919-843-9900.

Ethical approval

All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional

Conflicts of Interest

Deborah K. Mayer, Stock Holder for CareVive

Authors have no other potential conflict of interests to disclose.

Implications for survivors—Increasing physical activity in colon cancer survivors has the potential to improve quality of life and reduce recurrences. Using smart phone tracking devices may be useful in helping to change this health behavior. Trial registration number: [NCT01133132]

Keywords

colon cancer; physical activity; cancer survivorship; surveillance; survivorship care plans; eHealth

Introduction

Physical activity (PA) has been inversely associated with a number of cancers, including colorectal cancers. (1–4) Additionally, evidence suggests that increasing PA after diagnosis may decrease recurrences and improve survival, particularly in breast, colon and prostate cancers. (5–7) The mechanisms of action for this effect are not known but may be related to changes in insulin pathways and inflammation. (3, 8, 9) Increased physical activity has many other benefits for cancer survivors including improved quality of life, physical functioning and reduced fatigue. (6, 10) Physical activity recommendations for cancer survivors include engaging in regular physical activity, avoiding inactivity or sedentary behaviors, return to normal daily activities as soon as possible following diagnosis, aiming to exercise at least 150 minutes per week and include strength training exercises at least two days per week unless contraindicated. (11)

Using mobile eHealth interventions to influence health behaviors has increased with the adoption of smartphones over the last decade. Almost all (90%) Americans now use a cell phone with 64% of them being smart phones; adoption is 74% for seniors 65 or older. (12) Many of the smart phone users seek health information and track health behaviors through health applications. (13–15) In a recent meta-analysis, Fanning and colleagues (16), evaluated 11 studies using mobile applications to increase physical activity. They found a significant overall effect size of 0.54 (95% confidence interval of 0.17–.91) of increasing physical activity using mobile applications, but only four of the studies were of good quality.

CHESS (Comprehensive Health Enhancement Support System) is an umbrella name for several eHealth interventions (www.chess.wisc.edu). Content is aimed at a sixth grade reading level and focused on specific needs identified in studies of the target population. Compared to the unrestricted Internet, the most important strength of CHESS may be its protected, guided universe of tailored information and support options provided in an integrated package with efficient navigation, thereby eliminating the need for complicated and frustrating online search and discovery. This approach has been tested in a number of previous randomized controlled trials that have shown benefit in different populations. We adapted CHESS for a mobile application to increase physical activity in colon cancer survivors (SurvivorCHESS). (17–23)

Self Determination Theory (SDT) provided a conceptual framework for the development and testing of SurvivorCHESS. (24) In SDT, to be successful in changing ones behavior requires the 1) development of *competence* in information gathering, decision-making, and behaviors they are trying to change, 2) has *social support* systems to help them deal with the

cancer experience, and 3) the *autonomy* that comes with regaining a sense of control over their lives. The individual's quality of life will improve and they will adopt or maintain healthy lifestyle behaviors (e.g. physical activity) that are in their best interests. This conceptual framework (figure 1) has been used in a number of CHES studies to explain possible mediation of the intervention on outcomes. (25)

Our primary aim was to determine the impact of SurvivorCHES on physical activity in colon cancer survivors, with the hypothesis that SurvivorCHES users would significantly increase this outcome compared to the control group. Secondary aims were to explore the impact of SurvivorCHES on quality of life and distress.

METHODS

Study Design

This was a 2-arm, single-blinded multisite randomized controlled trial. Participants were recruited from seven sites¹ across the United States between March 2010 and August 2012. Data collection ended in June 2013.

Eligibility criteria included: age of at least 21 years, pathologically confirmed stage I–III colon cancer, completed cancer treatment and at least six weeks postoperative to within 12 months of the diagnosis with no sign of recurrence, have any other cancers (except non-melanoma skin cancers), an activity level of less than 150 minutes per week as determined by the Godin Leisure Time Physical Activity Questionnaire (GLTPAQ) score of < 23 of moderate-to-vigorous activity (26–30), and no additional existing conditions that limited the ability to exercise.

Ethics & Informed consent—This study was approved by the relevant institutional review boards at all the centers. Participants provided written informed consent before starting the study.

Recruitment—Potential subjects were identified through medical records or a tumor registry database. A standardized recruitment script was used by the recruitment coordinators in a clinic setting or over the phone. Eligible subjects were consented and given baseline measures to complete prior to randomization.

Randomization—Upon completion of the baseline survey, subjects were randomized in a 1:1 ratio to the 6-month SurvivorCHES intervention or usual care control group stratified by gender and treatment (whether or not they received adjuvant chemotherapy).

¹University of Wisconsin Hospital & Clinics, WI, The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, TX, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, NC, Hartford Hospital's Helene and Harry Gray Cancer Center, CT, Marshfield Clinic, WI, Gundersen Lutheran, WI, and Columbia St. Mary's, WI

Intervention

Control Group—The control group received the National Cancer Institute’s “Facing Forward: Life after Cancer Treatment” booklet², the National Coalition for Cancer Survivorship’s Cancer Survival Toolbox³, and a pedometer.

Intervention—Participants randomized to the intervention group were given all materials provided to the control group, plus smartphones with the SurvivorCHESS application, along with voice and data service for the study period. After completing the six month study period, phone service was ended but subjects were permitted to keep the smartphones.

SurvivorCHESS is a smartphone CHESS application that included core services of skill building (promoting competence), support services (promoting relatedness) and information services and tools (promoting autonomy). It was designed and adapted from the CHESS application with input from colon cancer survivors to provide information and support to help individuals increase their daily activity levels. A goal of 150 minutes per week was set and various areas of services were provided: *My Tracker*, an area for physical activity logging and goal setting (to assure self-monitoring); *My Friends*, a social networking space consisting of other user profiles, individual messaging and a discussion forum for participating colon cancer survivors to provide social support; *Be Mobile*, a section offering information modules on physical activity and health; and *My Cancer Care*, a colon cancer survivorship care plan section providing support tools and information on coping and adapting to life after cancer diagnosis along with the American Society of Clinical Oncology recommended follow-up care plan (see Figure 2).

The initial application was fairly static. Users were presented with the same options and display every log in and the application was entirely user driven, with study staff observing but not participating. Early in the study, we recognized that attrition was a concern while technology was evolving, so plans to enhance the application were developed. These changes consisted of establishing a staff facilitator and adding more dynamic content. After six months, in September 2010, a certified personal trainer, known to users as “Coach”, was made available for users to ask questions about physical activity. The coach also began involvement and initiation in discussion group, and individual, tailored private messaging to inactive users. Discussion posts varied by topic but often focused on encouraging users to share information about themselves or how they remained active. Aesthetic changes were also made: an icon on the homepage let users know if they had new messages and discussion group threads were ordered with the most recent post or comment on top, where it was most obvious. Beginning in June 2011, there was increased interaction by the coach and the addition of a new section of content called Coaching Corner. In this space the coach could add content at any time for users. This included motivational messages, answers to common fitness questions and exercise videos featuring the coach. This content was also featured in a rotating, random fashion on the home screen to inform users of what was available and help the home page remain dynamic. The coach continued to promote discussion in the group forum and sent individually tailored, biweekly messages to all users based on use. A

²<https://www.cancer.gov/publications/patient-education/facing-forward>

³<http://www.canceradvocacy.org/resources/cancer-survival-toolbox/>

welcome message was also sent to all users within a week of being enrolled in the study introducing the participant to the coach. Additionally, phone notifications were added to remind users to track their exercise in SurvivorCHESS and to let them know when the Coach posted in discussion group. All of these cumulative changes/additions were in effect until the end of data collection.

Outcomes and Measures

Participants completed the study measures at baseline, three, six, and nine months. For participants randomized to SurvivorCHESS, use data was collected every time they accessed the application. The collected data for this analysis includes number of logins, pages viewed, and message content. We collected demographics and medical information about the cancer, body mass index and co-morbid conditions using OARS at baseline. We also measured comfort with Internet use with a 5-point Likert scale from ‘not at all’ (0) to ‘extremely’ comfortable (4).

Physical activity, the primary outcome, was measured using the GLTPAQ on which participants are asked, “During a typical 7-Day period (a week), how many times on the average do you do the following kinds of exercise for more than 15 minutes during your free time?,” for each of three exercise categories: strenuous (“heart beats rapidly”), moderate (“not exhausting”), and mild (“minimal effort”). Examples are given for each category of exercise. The total minutes were then calculated from the weekly frequencies of moderate and vigorous physical activity (MVPA) (excluding light activities). (26, 31)

Distress was measured using the NCCN Distress Tool. (32) This measure is self-administered and has a rating of 0 (lowest)–10 (highest) that measures overall distress and four categories of distress (yes/no) experienced over the past week. The categories of distress included practical [6 items], family [4 items], emotional [6 items] and physical [22 items] problems, and spiritual/religious [1] concerns). (33, 34) This instrument was used at each of the assessments.

Quality of Life was measured using the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Colon (FACT-C, version 4). (35) This is a 27-item compilation of general questions in four primary QOL domains: Physical Well-Being, Social/Family Well-Being, Emotional Well-Being, and Functional Well-Being with 10 additional items that are colon cancer specific. It is designed for self-administration, but can also be administered by interview format (person-to-person and over the telephone). Acceptable levels of reliability and validity have been established in adults with cancer. Responses are on a five-point Likert scale from ‘not at all’ to ‘very much’ over the last week. Total FACT-C scores could range from 0–136 with higher scores indicating better QOL.

Mediators—Self-determination theory constructs of autonomy and relatedness with other cancer survivors were assessed with the Treatment Self-Regulation Questionnaire [TSRQ] autonomous motivation subscale (13) and the McTavish Bonding Scale (36), respectively. The TSRQ consists of 15 items on a 7-point Likert scale (not at all true to very true) used to assess the degree to which a person’s motivation is autonomous or self-determined. Previous tests found good reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .88$) and predicted change in health-related

behavior ($p<.001$). The McTavish Bonding Scale is a 5-item, single factor instrument developed to measure the extent to which survivors have bonded with or established relationships with other cancer patients through the intervention. Items are scored on a Likert-type scale (0=never to 4=nearly always). The Bonding Scale has demonstrated high internal consistency reliability in a study of breast cancer patients at pretest and at 6 weeks (.92 and .93 respectively).

We counted ‘use’ of the intervention as entering the SurvivorCHESS program beyond the homepage with ‘active’ users defined as creating content or entering or revising data while all other views were considered passive.

Statistical Analysis—We estimated that a final sample size of 234 would be required to detect a moderately small effect size of .33 with .80 power, a two-tailed α of .05, and autocorrelations of .60, and targeted total recruitment of 294 patients to account for attrition and missing data.

Godin measures at all time points had a large portion of 0s and, therefore, are not normally distribution. Mann-Whitney U, a nonparametric test, was used to test for the intervention effect. Analysis of covariance was used to assess the intervention effect for the primary outcome of physical activity and secondary outcomes of quality of life and distress. For all outcomes, gender (male; female) and treatment regimen (surgery only; surgery plus chemotherapy) were included as design variables and the baseline score of the given outcome was included as a covariate. The durability of the intervention effect was analyzed using the same model, but with the assessment of physical activity at six months rather than at baseline serving as the covariate. Mediation was examined using the Test for Joint Significance (37), which requires a significant relationship between (1) the intervention and potential mediator (path a) and (2) the outcome and the potential mediator, controlling for intervention (path b). All analyses were and conducted with SPSS version 21. No imputations were made for missing data.

Results

Study Population—522 potential subjects were identified for participation (see consort diagram in Figure 3); 181 declined participation due to lack of interest, being too busy, not providing consent or returning baseline measures or for other reasons. Another 57 were not eligible because they exercised more than 150 minutes per week, had medical issues that prevented participation, or other reasons. Informed consent and a baseline survey were obtained from the remaining 284 individuals, and each was then randomized to either the intervention group ($n=144$) or control ($n=140$). Attrition was 28.1% for the control group and 18.2% for the intervention group at six months for a total evaluable sample for 227 of the 234 identified in our power analysis.

Participant description—Demographics are presented by group in Table 1. There were no significant differences between the intervention and control group ($p = .87$) but there was by disease stage ($p=.036$) as there were more stage III patients in the intervention arm.

Intent to Treat Analysis—For the primary outcome of physical activity (at 6 months) that only counted the moderate and vigorous (or strenuous) data (MVPA), the intervention effect was not significant [$F(1, 221)=2.404$, $p=.122$]. The intervention effect for the same outcome at 9 months controlling for the 6-month outcome is also not statistically significant [$F(1, 202)=0.722$, $p=.396$]. SurvivorCHESS participants reporting greater physical activity at six months (mean = 49.98 minutes, s.d. 45.28) than those in the control group (mean = 40.27 minutes, s.d. 42.22) ($p=0.083$). However, no significant differences between groups were observed for the durability of the intervention effect at 9 months (See figure 4). Both groups were classified as insufficiently active at baseline and moved to moderately active at 6 and 9 months. At six months, 27% ($n=30/111$) in the control group and 38.8% ($n=45/116$) in the SurvivorChess group had MMVPA scores that were 150 minutes/week with similar findings at nine months (27.7% and 35.8% respectively).

Quality of Life—Quality of life was not significantly different between the intervention and control groups over time. The overall baseline FACT-C scores were 103.3 in the control group and 105 in the SCHESS group and increased to 106.5 and 109.1 respectively; between group difference of the total score, controlling for gender and treatment, were not significantly different ($p=0.39$). Subscales of physical, social, emotional and functional well-being were also not significantly different ($p> 0.24$ for all) between the intervention and control groups over time. (figure 7)

Distress—(figure 8). Distress was not significantly different between the intervention and control groups over time. The overall baseline distress scores were 3.36 in the control group and 2.98 in the SCHESS group and decreased to 2.96 respectively; between group difference of the score, controlling for gender and treatment, were not significantly different ($p>0.17$ over time). The number of endorsed categories were not significantly different between the groups over time. Physical problems were greater than the other categories followed by emotional problems. The number of items endorsed declined slightly in both groups over the six-month study but was not significant.

Effect of Use on Outcomes—A SurvivorCHESS user was defined as someone who accessed the system beyond the login page at least once during the study. Of the 144 participants randomized to SurvivorCHESS, 135 (93.8%) were identified as users. Of the nine participants identified as non-users, five never accessed the system and four accessed the system but never proceeded beyond the login page. In a sensitivity analysis, we compared the control group to just SurvivorCHESS *users* (rather than to those randomized to SurvivorCHESS); because of the small sample size, SurvivorCHESS non-users were omitted from the analysis rather than be included as a distinct third comparison group. There were no substantive differences in results when the control group was compared to the full intervention group or when it was compared to the intervention group who used the system.

SurvivorCHESS Use—For the intervention group, use was greatest in the first week and declined over the six months of the study, though the mean number of pages viewed per week stayed relatively consistent from week five through the end of the study period (figure 5). Of the possible 180 *days* of use, the mean number of use was 55.3 (s.d. 50.0, median 34,

range 1–178); of the possible 24 weeks of use, the mean number of system use was 15.7 (s.d. 9.1, median 16, range 1–27). *My Tracker* was the most accessed SurvivorCHESS service, with a mean of 713.0 (s.d. 831.7, median 376 and range 1–4221) followed by *My Friends* with a mean of 287.0 (s.d. 509.9, median 117 and range 1–3983); *My Cancer Care* was accessed the least with a mean of 30.63 (s.d.38.41, median 12 and range 1–200) (figure 6).

Mechanism of Effect—We considered three avenues through which the intervention may affect physical activity at six months: 1) the SDT construct of relatedness, as measured by the McTavish Bonding Scale; 2) the SDT construct of autonomous motivation, as measured by Treatment Self-Regulation Scale; and 3) the act of self-monitoring exercise, defined as the number of days using the SurvivorCHESS *MyTracker* service (in the intervention group). Temporal priority was assured by using assessments of the mediators from time points that preceded the primary endpoint (six months): values for relatedness and autonomous motivation were taken from the three month survey and exercise tracking was aggregated across the first 3 months on study. Relatedness was not found to be a significant mediator of the effect of SurvivorCHESS on physical activity; it was not a significant predictor of relatedness at three months and this was not a significant predictor of physical activity at six months, controlling for intervention group. Autonomous motivation was not found to mediate the effect of the SurvivorCHESS intervention on physical activity: the intervention did not significantly predict autonomous motivation at three months, though autonomous motivation at three months was significantly predictive of physical activity at six months when controlling for intervention group.

Post hoc analyses—We then conducted an analysis that included intervention group, gender, colon cancer treatment group, baseline GLTPAQ, controlling for number of comorbid conditions (0 or 1 vs >1), and pre-cancer exercise status (yes or no). We did not find prior exercise as significantly influencing outcomes ($p=.984$) but did find that the number of comorbid conditions did ($p=.004$) with higher number of conditions associated with less activity. It should be noted that the number of comorbid conditions were significantly associated with BMI, meaning higher BMI was associated with more comorbid conditions.

Barriers to exercise—The biggest barriers to use were similar to those that other people face when it comes to exercise such as not enough time in the day. For our study population, other commitments and other health challenges were reported as major barriers to exercising. Study participants reported trying to balance caring for other relatives, managing doctors appointments for their significant other and themselves or having to work more were often the reasons cited for not exercising more.

Harms—There were no injuries reported during the course of the study. Two issues that interfered with use included unanticipated medical issues or procedures that limited ability to exercise and technical difficulties with the phone/service that prevented ability to track exercise.

Discussion

This randomized controlled trial using a smart phone intervention in colon cancer survivors to increase physical activity within the first year of diagnosis. We did see an increase in both groups from insufficiently active at baseline to moderately active. SurvivorCHESS users increase at six months was not sustained three months after the intervention ended. We also were not able to demonstrate support for Self-Determination Theory to mediate or explain our findings. We were able to demonstrate ability to use the intervention but saw a decrease in use over time.

Limitations

Limitations in this study included conducting a study in the face of rapidly changing technologies and increasing acceptance of technology over time. Our sample may have been biased toward those who are comfortable with new technologies. In addition, Caucasians were over-represented (89% Caucasian) and participants were more highly educated (46% had at least a bachelor's degree), and had more health insurance (97%) than the general U.S. population. Challenges included finding reliable carriers to provide service to the geographically diverse groups of participants in urban, suburban and rural settings.

Comparison with Prior CHESS Work

CHESS programs have been developed and tested (mostly in randomized trials) for numerous conditions ranging from breast (38) and lung cancer to HIV and addictive disorders (39), and others such as aging, asthma, menopause (40) and bone marrow transplant. CHESS has been created for patients, caregivers, and families. In general their most common benefit is improvements in quality of life although positive changes in health service use (41), symptom distress, and social support have been noted for some conditions.

Within those studies we have periodically examined meditational effects of self-determination theory and the general conclusion is that it varies with the condition. For instance, the benefits to asthma caregivers seem to be mediated by relatedness but not by competence. This may make sense in asthma because many of the key interventions (avoid smoking, use an inhaler) are not particularly hard to learn. But for parents of young kids who can resist things like inhalers, the key is to keep on keeping on (25). And for that the ongoing support of other parents who understand what one is going through can be particularly important. In addition, competence such as building refusal skills, may be particularly important and thus competence mediated the effect of A-CHESS on risky drinking days. (19) We were not able to measure a mediation effect of SDT on physical activity outcomes. As more mobile phone apps are developed to change health behaviors, attention to use of health behavior and communication theories will still be important. (42)

In a review of mobile phone apps ability to change health behaviors, self-monitoring was the most common change noted (15). We found that the *MyTracker* was the most used function of the intervention. Apps that were more effective included having user-friendly designs, real-time feedback, individualized elements, detailed information and health professional

involvement.(15) We were disappointed that the other features, specifically the colon cancer specific follow-up care guidelines, were less well utilized.

Comparisons with other physical activity studies

Web-based—Kuijpers and colleagues identified seven elements common to web-based physical activity studies in chronic diseases including education, self-monitoring, feedback/tailored information, self-management training, personal exercise programs, and communication with health care providers or fellow patients. (43) SurvivorCHESS included all seven elements. They identified 19 papers in their systematic review with eight demonstrating increased physical activity. The use of mobile or tablet apps has been shown to benefit others with chronic illnesses. (14) While we found a significant improvement in physical activity in the intervention group at six months it was not sustained at nine months.

Like the RENEW trial, which was conducted in a sample of 641 colorectal, breast and prostate cancer, SCHESS survivors who had lower comorbidity and BMI were more apt to respond to the intervention (44, 45), though in the current study impact on physical functioning was not observed. Unlike RENEW, however, SurvivorCHESS did not lead to durable improvements in physical activity. While this may be attributable to the different behavioral theory (Self-Determination Theory vs. Social Cognitive Theory) and a different mode of intervention delivery (Web-based/smart phone vs. tailored print and telephone counseling), it could very well be the result of the intervention being too brief, since Project LEAD (a forerunner of the RENEW intervention) (46), also did not show durable changes in behavior with a 6-month intervention, whereas the 12-month intervention tested in the RENEW trial resulted in durable changes in physical activity, dietary behaviors and weight loss.(47)

In person—Courneya and colleagues reported on a structured physical exercise program in colon cancer survivors and demonstrated an increase in activity and resulting objective fitness improvements.(48) Other studies have shown a reduction of fatigue during treatment with increasing physical activity in this population. (49)

Comparison to other mHealth interventions

The personal use of smart phones has grown tremendously from 11% in 2011 to 77% in 2016.(50) The development of apps for health promotion and management has grown as well and has demonstrated some efficacy in changing health behaviors and in promoting self-management of chronic conditions. (14, 15, 51) Mechanisms for behavior change include self-monitoring, performance feedback, and message tailoring and are approaches used in SurvivorCHESS.(15, 51) Our results were disappointing as we did not find a difference between groups although both groups did improve their activity over time. An ehealth intervention to increase physical activity and health eating for older cancer survivors saw a decline in physical activity in both the intervention and control group.(52) A face-to-face intervention to increase recreational physical activity in colon cancer survivors was found to be successful.(48)

Implications for Cancer Survivors

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is the third leading cancer in US with a prevalence of over 1 million representing 9% of the 15.5 million survivors.(53) This is a large group that could benefit from interventions to increase physical activity to improve quality of life and other clinical outcomes. (6, 54) However, they not often receive or adhere to health behaviors such as being physically active, maintaining a healthy weight and eating a healthy diet.(55–57) Developing and delivering eHealth interventions may be one way to encourage health behavior change in cancer survivors. (15, 42) However, efforts will need to be made in sustaining any improvements in behaviors.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank all participants and staff involved in this study. We would also like to thank Ming-Yuan Chih, PhD, University of Kentucky College of Health Sciences for his assistance with additional statistical analyses. This study was supported by a grant from the National Cancer Institute (P50 CA095817). This paper is based on a presentation at the NCI Centers of Excellence in Cancer Communication Research (CECCR) 2013 Grantee Meeting, Ann Arbor, MI.

Funding: P50 CA095817 (D. Gustafson, PI)

References

1. Ballard-Barbash R, Potosky AL, Harlan LC, Nayfield SG, Kessler LG. Factors associated with surgical and radiation therapy for early stage breast cancer in older women. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 1996 Jun 5; 88(11):716–26. [PubMed: 8637025]
2. Arem H, Pfeiffer RM, Engels EA, Alfano CM, Hollenbeck A, Park Y, et al. Pre- and Postdiagnosis Physical Activity, Television Viewing, and Mortality Among Patients With Colorectal Cancer in the National Institutes of Health-AARP Diet and Health Study. *J Clin Oncol.* 2014 Dec 8.
3. Lemanne D, Cassileth B, Gubili J. The role of physical activity in cancer prevention, treatment, recovery, and survivorship. *Oncology (Williston Park).* 2013 Jun; 27(6):580–5. [PubMed: 23909073]
4. Winzer BM, Whiteman DC, Reeves MM, Paratz JD. Physical activity and cancer prevention: a systematic review of clinical trials. *Cancer Causes Control.* 2011; 22(6):811. [PubMed: 21461921]
5. Gunnell AS, Joyce S, Tomlin S, Taaffe DR, Cormie P, Newton RU, et al. Physical Activity and Survival among Long-term Cancer Survivor and Non-Cancer Cohorts. *Front Public Health.* 2017 Feb 14;5:19. [PubMed: 28261579]
6. Fong DY, Ho JW, Hui BP, Lee AM, Macfarlane DJ, Leung SS, et al. Physical activity for cancer survivors: meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ.* 2012 Jan 30;344:e70. [PubMed: 22294757]
7. Wu W, Guo F, Ye J, Li Y, Shi D, Fang D, et al. Pre- and post-diagnosis physical activity is associated with survival benefits of colorectal cancer patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Oncotarget.* 2016 Aug 9; 7(32):52095–103. [PubMed: 27437765]
8. Anzuini F, Battistella A, Izzotti A. Physical activity and cancer prevention: a review of current evidence and biological mechanisms. *J Prev Med Hyg.* 2011 Dec; 52(4):174–80. [PubMed: 22442921]
9. Ballard-Barbash R, Friedenreich CM, Courneya KS, Siddiqi SM, McTiernan A, Alfano CM. Physical activity, biomarkers, and disease outcomes in cancer survivors: a systematic review. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2012 Jun 6; 104(11):815–40. [PubMed: 22570317]
10. Meneses-Echavez JF, Gonzalez-Jimenez E, Ramirez-Velez R. Supervised exercise reduces cancer-related fatigue: a systematic review. *J Physiother.* 2014 Dec 12.
11. Rock CL, Doyle C, Demark-Wahnefried W, Meyerhardt J, Courneya KS, Schwartz AL, et al. Nutrition and physical activity guidelines for cancer survivors. *CA Cancer J Clin.* 2012 Jul-Aug; 62(4):243–74. [PubMed: 22539238]

12. Cell Phone and Smartphone Ownership Demographics [Internet]. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center; 2014. [cited 9/2/16]. Available from: <http://www.pewinternet.org/data-trend/mobile/cell-phone-and-smartphone-ownership-demographics/>
13. Mobile Health 2012 [Internet]. Pew Research Internet Project; [cited 12/26/14]. Available from: <http://pewinternet.org/Reports/2012/Mobile-Health.aspx>
14. Whitehead L, Seaton P. The Effectiveness of Self-Management Mobile Phone and Tablet Apps in Long-term Condition Management: A Systematic Review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2016 May 16.18(5):e97. [PubMed: 27185295]
15. Zhao J, Freeman B, Li M. Can Mobile Phone Apps Influence People's Health Behavior Change? An Evidence Review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2016 Oct 31.18(11):e287. [PubMed: 27806926]
16. Fanning J, Mullen SP, McAuley E. Increasing physical activity with mobile devices: a meta-analysis. *J Med Internet Res*. 2012 Nov 21.14(6):e161. [PubMed: 23171838]
17. Gustafson DH, McTavish FM, Chih MY, Atwood AK, Johnson RA, Boyle MG, et al. A smartphone application to support recovery from alcoholism: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2014 May; 71(5):566–72. [PubMed: 24671165]
18. Gustafson DH, Boyle MG, Shaw BR, Isham A, McTavish F, Richards S, et al. An e-health solution for people with alcohol problems. *Alcohol Res Health*. 2011; 33(4):327–37. [PubMed: 23293549]
19. Gustafson DH, DuBenske LL, Namkoong K, Hawkins R, Chih MY, Atwood AK, et al. An eHealth system supporting palliative care for patients with non-small cell lung cancer: a randomized trial. *Cancer*. 2013 May 1; 119(9):1744–51. [PubMed: 23355273]
20. DuBenske LL, Wen KY, Gustafson DH, Guarnaccia CA, Cleary JF, Dinauer SK, et al. Caregivers' differing needs across key experiences of the advanced cancer disease trajectory. *Palliat Support Care*. 2008 Sep; 6(3):265–72. [PubMed: 18662420]
21. DuBenske LL, Gustafson DH, Namkoong K, Hawkins RP, Atwood AK, Brown RL, et al. CHES improves cancer caregivers' burden and mood: results of an eHealth RCT. *Health Psychol*. 2014 Oct; 33(10):1261–72. [PubMed: 24245838]
22. Gustafson DH, Bosworth K, Hawkins RP, Boberg EW, Bricker E. CHES: a computer-based system for providing information, referrals, decision support and social support to people facing medical and other health-related crises. *Proc Annu Symp Comput Appl Med Care*. 1992:161–5. [PubMed: 1482860]
23. Chih MY, DuBenske LL, Hawkins RP, Brown RL, Dinauer SK, Cleary JF, et al. Communicating advanced cancer patients' symptoms via the Internet: a pooled analysis of two randomized trials examining caregiver preparedness, physical burden, and negative mood. *Palliat Med*. 2013 Jun; 27(6):533–43. [PubMed: 22988042]
24. Deci, E., Ryan, R. *Handbook of Self-Determination Research*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press; 2002.
25. Gustafson D, Wise M, Bhattacharya A, Pulvermacher A, Shanovich K, Phillips B, et al. The effects of combining Web-based eHealth with telephone nurse case management for pediatric asthma control: a randomized controlled trial. *J Med Internet Res*. 2012 Jul 26.14(4):e101. [PubMed: 22835804]
26. Godin G, Shephard RJ. A simple method to assess exercise behavior in the community. *Can J Appl Sport Sci*. 1985 Sep; 10(3):141–6. [PubMed: 4053261]
27. Gionet NJ, Godin G. Self-reported exercise behavior of employees: a validity study. *J Occup Med*. 1989 Dec; 31(12):969–73. [PubMed: 2614536]
28. Jacobs DR Jr, Ainsworth BE, Hartman TJ, Leon AS. A simultaneous evaluation of 10 commonly used physical activity questionnaires. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 1993 Jan; 25(1):81–91. [PubMed: 8423759]
29. Amireault S, Godin G. The Godin-Shephard leisure-time physical activity questionnaire: validity evidence supporting its use for classifying healthy adults into active and insufficiently active categories. *Percept Mot Skills*. 2015 Apr; 120(2):604–22. [PubMed: 25799030]
30. Amireault S, Godin G, Lacombe J, Sabiston CM. The use of the Godin-Shephard Leisure-Time Physical Activity Questionnaire in oncology research: a systematic review. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2015 Aug 12.15 60,015-0045-7.

31. Godin G. The Godin-Shephard Leisure-Time Exercise Questionnaire. *Health and Fitness Journal of Canada*. 2011; 4(1):18–22.
32. NCCN Distress Management [Internet]. National Comprehensive Cancer Network; 2016. [cited 4/2/17]. Available from: https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/distress.pdf
33. Jacobsen PB, Donovan KA, Trask PC, Fleishman SB, Zabora J, Baker F, et al. Screening for psychologic distress in ambulatory cancer patients. *Cancer*. 2005 Apr 1; 103(7):1494–502. [PubMed: 15726544]
34. Mitchell AJ. Pooled results from 38 analyses of the accuracy of distress thermometer and other ultra-short methods of detecting cancer-related mood disorders. *J Clin Oncol*. 2007 Oct 10; 25(29):4670–81. [PubMed: 17846453]
35. Ward WL, Hahn EA, Mo F, Hernandez L, Tulskey DS, Cella D. Reliability and validity of the Functional Assessment of Cancer Therapy-Colorectal (FACT-C) quality of life instrument. *Qual Life Res*. 1999 May; 8(3):181–95. [PubMed: 10472150]
36. Gustafson DH, Hawkins R, McTavish F, Pingree S, Chen WC, Volrathongchai K, et al. Internet-Based Interactive Support for Cancer Patients: Are Integrated Systems Better? *J Commun*. 2008 Jun; 58(2):238–57. [PubMed: 21804645]
37. Cohen, J., Cohen, P. *Applied Multiple Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum; 1983.
38. Gustafson DH, Hawkins R, Pingree S, McTavish F, Arora NK, Mendenhall J, et al. Effect of computer support on younger women with breast cancer. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2001 Jul; 16(7):435–45. [PubMed: 11520380]
39. Japuntich SJ, Zehner ME, Smith SS, Jorenby DE, Valdez JA, Fiore MC, et al. Smoking cessation via the internet: a randomized clinical trial of an internet intervention as adjuvant treatment in a smoking cessation intervention. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2006 Dec; 8(Suppl 1):S59–67. [PubMed: 17491172]
40. Saver BG, Gustafson D, Taylor TR, Hawkins RP, Woods NF, Dinauer S, et al. A tale of two studies: the importance of setting, subjects and context in two randomized, controlled trials of a web-based decision support for perimenopausal and postmenopausal health decisions. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2007 May; 66(2):211–22. [PubMed: 17317080]
41. Gustafson DH, Hawkins R, Boberg E, Pingree S, Serlin RE, Graziano F, et al. Impact of a patient-centered, computer-based health information/support system. *Am J Prev Med*. 1999 Jan; 16(1):1–9.
42. Vollmer Dahlke D, Fair K, Hong YA, Beaudoin CE, Pulczynski J, Ory MG. Apps seeking theories: results of a study on the use of health behavior change theories in cancer survivorship mobile apps. *JMIR Mhealth Uhealth*. 2015 Mar 27; 3(1):e31. [PubMed: 25830810]
43. Kuijpers W, Groen WG, Aaronson NK, van Harten WH. A systematic review of web-based interventions for patient empowerment and physical activity in chronic diseases: relevance for cancer survivors. *J Med Internet Res*. 2013 Feb 20; 15(2):e37. [PubMed: 23425685]
44. Morey MC, Blair CK, Sloane R, Cohen HJ, Snyder DC, Demark-Wahnefried W. Group trajectory analysis helps to identify older cancer survivors who benefit from distance-based lifestyle interventions. *Cancer*. 2015 Dec 15; 121(24):4433–40. [PubMed: 26512712]
45. Kenzik KM, Morey MC, Cohen HJ, Sloane R, Demark-Wahnefried W. Symptoms, weight loss, and physical function in a lifestyle intervention study of older cancer survivors. *J Geriatr Oncol*. 2015 Nov; 6(6):424–32. [PubMed: 26362355]
46. Demark-Wahnefried W, Clipp EC, Morey MC, Pieper CF, Sloane R, Snyder DC, et al. Lifestyle intervention development study to improve physical function in older adults with cancer: outcomes from Project LEAD. *J Clin Oncol*. 2006 Jul 20; 24(21):3465–73. [PubMed: 16849763]
47. Demark-Wahnefried W, Morey MC, Sloane R, Snyder DC, Miller PE, Hartman TJ, et al. Reach out to enhance wellness home-based diet-exercise intervention promotes reproducible and sustainable long-term improvements in health behaviors, body weight, and physical functioning in older, overweight/obese cancer survivors. *J Clin Oncol*. 2012 Jul 1; 30(19):2354–61. [PubMed: 22614994]
48. Courneya KS, Vardy JL, O'Callaghan CJ, Friedenreich CM, Campbell KL, Prapavessis H, et al. Effects of a Structured Exercise Program on Physical Activity and Fitness in Colon Cancer

- Survivors: One Year Feasibility Results from the CHALLENGE Trial. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2016 Jun; 25(6):969–77. [PubMed: 27197271]
49. Van Vulpen JK, Velthuis MJ, Steins Bisschop CN, Travier N, Van Den Buijs BJ, Backx FJ, et al. Effects of an Exercise Program in Colon Cancer Patients undergoing Chemotherapy. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2016 May; 48(5):767–75. [PubMed: 26694846]
50. Mobile Fact Sheet [Internet]. Pew Research Center Internet & Technology; 2017. [updated January 12, 2017; cited 8/5/17]. Available from: <http://www.pewinternet.org/fact-sheet/mobile/>
51. Ernsting C, Dombrowski SU, Oedekoven M, O Sullivan JL, Kanzler M, Kuhlmeier A, et al. Using Smartphones and Health Apps to Change and Manage Health Behaviors: A Population-Based Survey. *J Med Internet Res.* 2017 Apr 5.19(4):e101. [PubMed: 28381394]
52. Krebs P, Shtaynberger J, McCabe M, Iocolano M, Williams K, Shuk E, et al. An eHealth Intervention to Increase Physical Activity and Healthy Eating in Older Adult Cancer Survivors: Summative Evaluation Results. *JMIR Cancer.* 2017; 3(1):e4. [PubMed: 28410171]
53. SEER Stat Fact Sheets: Colon and Rectum Cancer [Internet]. Bethesda, MD: National Cancer Institute; [cited 12/26/14]. Available from: <http://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/colorect.html>
54. Van Blarigan EL, Meyerhardt JA. Role of physical activity and diet after colorectal cancer diagnosis. *J Clin Oncol.* 2015 Jun 1; 33(16):1825–34. [PubMed: 25918293]
55. Winkels RM, Heine-Broring RC, van Zutphen M, van Harten-Gerritsen S, Kok DE, van Duijnhoven FJ, et al. The COLON study: Colorectal cancer: Longitudinal, Observational study on Nutritional and lifestyle factors that may influence colorectal tumour recurrence, survival and quality of life. *BMC Cancer.* 2014 May 27.14 374,2407-14-374.
56. Winkels RM, van Lee L, Beijer S, Bours MJ, van Duijnhoven FJ, Geelen A, et al. Adherence to the World Cancer Research Fund/American Institute for Cancer Research lifestyle recommendations in colorectal cancer survivors: results of the PROFILES registry. *Cancer Med.* 2016 Jul 14.
57. Nyrop KA, Deal AM, Williams GR, Guerard EJ, Pergolotti M, Muss HB. Physical activity communication between oncology providers and patients with early-stage breast, colon, or prostate cancer. *Cancer.* 2016 Feb 1; 122(3):470–6. [PubMed: 26566177]

Figure 1.
Self-Determination Theory Applied to SurvivorChess

Figure 2.
SurvivorCHESS Application Homepage

Figure 3.
Consort Diagram

Figure 4.
Mean Godin Scores
* $p=0.045$ at 6 months
** $p=0.97$ at 9 months

Figure 5.
Pages accessed over time

Figure 6.
Number SurvivorCHESS Pages by Service Category

Figure 7.
FACT-C Quality of Life

Figure 8.
NUMBER OF ENDORSED DISTRESS ITEMS

Table 1

SurvivorCHES Demographics at Baseline (n= 284)

	Internet (n=140)		SCHESS (n=144)	
	N	%	N	%
Gender				
Male	67	48%	70	49%
Female	73	52%	74	51%
Race				
Caucasian	124	89%	128	89%
Other	16	11%	16	11%
Employment				
Retired	46	33%	43	30%
Full-Time	57	41%	60	42%
Part-Time	14	10%	19	13%
Medical Leave	7	5%	10	7%
Other	15	11%	12	8%
Education				
No High School Degree	7	5%	7	5%
High School Degree	22	16%	23	16%
Some College Courses	33	24%	29	20%
Associate Or Technical Degree	21	15%	13	9%
Bachelor's Degree	33	24%	35	24%
Graduate Degree	24	17%	37	26%
Health Insurance				
Have	137	99%	139	97%
Do not have	2	1%	5	3%
Living Situation				
Not alone	114	81%	125	87%
Alone	26	19%	19	13%
Colon Cancer stage				
I	27	20%	39	27%

	Internet (n=140)		SCHESS (n=144)	
	N	%	N	%
II	82	59%	63	44%
III	29	21%	41	29%
Treatment Regimen				
Surgery only	69	49%	78	55%
Surgery + chemotherapy	71	51%	65	45%
Previous exerciser?				
No	46	33%	48	33%
Yes	83	59%	86	60%
BMI				
Underweight: < 18.5	3	3%	1	1%
Normal weight: 18.5 to 24.9	31	30%	25	27%
Overweight: 25 to 29.9	35	34%	29	31%
Obese: > 30.0	34	33%	39	41%
ECOG Performance Status				
0 (fully active)	44	54%	41	66%
1 (restricted but ambulatory and able to carry out light work)	15	18%	10	16%
2 (Ambulatory but unable to carry out any work activities)	23	28%	11	18%
Have Ostomy Appliance				
No	126	95%	135	96%
Yes	7	5%	5	4%
	N	M (SD)	N	M (SD)
Age	104	57.84 (14.5)	115	59.34 (13.7)
Internet comfort ^a	137	2.75 (1.3)	141	2.73 (1.2)
Godin Physical Activity ^b	139	13.16 (12.9)	144	14.3 (13.7)
OARS Co-Morbidity ^c	139	2.24 (1.7)	144	2.01 (1.8)
OARS Physical Health Rating Scale ^d	137	2.49 (0.8)	143	2.41 (0.9)
Self-Determination Theory Constructs^e				
TSRQ – Autonomous	138	4.6 (1.26)	143	4.9 (1.08)

	Internet (n=140)		SCHESS (n=144)	
	N	%	N	%
TSRQ – Controlled	138	1.82 (1.38)	141	2.04 (1.27)
TSRQ – Amotivation	135	1.26 (1.17)	135	1.18 (1.18)
Perceived Competence Scale	138	3.95 (1.62)	142	4.38 (1.57)
Family Care Climate Measure	107	3.09 (1.85)	103	3.49 (1.61)
Health Care Climate Questionnaire	134	2.65 (2.08)	136	2.72 (1.91)
Bonding	137	1.44 (1.09)	137	1.61 (0.97)

^aInternet comfort was measured on a scale from 0 (“not comfortable at all”) to 4 (“extremely comfortable”).

^bGodin Leisure Score Index: <14 light activity, 14 – 23 moderately active, and > 24 strenuous activity.

^cNumber of co-morbid conditions

^dself-reported physical health rating from 1 (excellent physical health) to 6 (totally physically impaired)

^eTSRQ has 15 items on a 7-point Likert scale (not at all true to very true) used to assess the degree to which a person’s motivation is autonomous or self-determined. The Bonding Scale is a 5-item, single factor instrument developed to measure the extent to which survivors have bonded with (established relationships with) other cancer patients scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale (0=never to 4=nearly always).